

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/828,542	MCKINZIE, WILLIAM E.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Seungsook Ham	2817	

All Participants:

(1) Seungsook Ham.

(2) Steven Moore (Reg. #55,462).

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 6 June 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

44-46 and 49-67

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/828,542	MCKINZIE, WILLIAM E.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Seungsook Ham	2817	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Seungsook Ham. (3) _____.
- (2) Alan C. Gordon. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 04 May 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-78 (proposed amendment).

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner indicated that the proposed amendment will not be entered since the newly added limitation raises new issues. The applicant suggested amending the claims that the examiner indicated as allowable subject matter in the final office action.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner pointed out that newly amended claims 44-46 and 49-67 raises new issues since these claims were withdrawn in the previous office action as non-elected invention (see Office Action mailed on 2/22/06). And, now the applicant amended the claims to overcome the restriction requirement. Thus, it requires further consideration and search. The applicant agreed to cancel claims 44-46 and 49-67 and suggested filing a divisional application for the canceled claims 44-46, and 49-67. .